

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 2, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority. However, Applicants respectfully point out that box 12(a)(3) should be indicated on PTOL-326 rather than box 12(a)(1).

As indicated above, claims 10 and 11 have been amended to be directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 9-11 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claims 1 claims an information processing apparatus, claim 9 claims a method, claim 10 claims a program, and claim 11 claims a computer-readable record medium. The apparatus, method, program and medium include generating management information that associates a first identifier with information about the data. A second identifier is generated at least when an edit list is added that can identify the data in a storage area of the record medium.

By generating a second identifier at least when an edit list is added, as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11, the claimed invention provides an apparatus, method, program and medium so that a record process and a reproduction process can be easily performed. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *David, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0131764).

David, et al. appears to disclose a processing system comprising a recorder for recording video and/or audio and/or data material on a recording medium and includes a first generator for generating a first material identifier for identifying respective pieces of material on the medium and a second generator for generating second universally unique, identifiers for pieces of material, the second identifier is generated with respect to one or more of the first identifiers [0010]. A camcorder 500 records video and audio material on a recording medium. A database processor 176 stores metadata which relates to the material recorded on the tape 126 [0090]. The metadata is linked to the material by UMIDs and by at least MURNs. The MURNs are intended to uniquely identify each piece of material on the tape [0091]. MURNs are generated as the material is recorded on the tape [0093].

Thus, *David, et al.* merely discloses that the MURNs are generated as the material is recorded on the tape. Thus, nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests generating a second identifier at least when an edit list is added as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *David, et al.* merely discloses that the MURNs are generated as the material is recorded onto the tape.

Since nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests generating a second identifier at least when an edit list is added as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 would not have been anticipated by *David, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants


By: _____

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530

Date: May 15, 2009